Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	EB Docket No. 03-152
************)	E ''' E N 50650
WILLIAM L. ZAWILA)	Facility ID No. 72672
Permittee of FM Station KNGS,)	
Coalinga, California)	
AVENAL EDUCATIONAL SEDVICES)	Encility ID No. 2265
AVENAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES, INC.)	Facility ID No. 3365
Permittee of FM Station KAAX,)	
Avenal, California)	
CENTRAL VALLEY EDUCATIONAL SERVICES, INC.)	Facility ID No. 9993
Permittee of FM Station KYAF,)	
Firebaugh, California)	
H. L. CHARLES D/B/A FORD CITY BROADCASTING)	Facility ID No. 22030
Permittee of FM Station KZPE,)	
Ford City, California)	
LINDA WARE D/B/A LINDSAY BROADCASTING)	Facility ID No. 37725
Licensee of FM Station KZPO,)	
Lindsay, California)	40

To: Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary

Attn: Chief Administrative Law Judge Richard L. Sippel

ENFORCEMENT BUREAU'S OPPOSITION TO CENTRAL VALLEY AND AVENAL'S BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO ORDER, FCC 16M-12

- 1. On January 14, 2016, Central Valley Educational Services, Inc. (Central Valley) and Avenal Educational Services, Inc. (Avenal) filed a request to appeal the Presiding Judge's *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, FCC 16M-01, adding issues to the above-captioned matter (Request). The Presiding Judge requested that the Enforcement Bureau (Bureau) respond to this Request. The Presiding Judge then requested additional briefing. On March 15, 2016, Central Valley and Avenal submitted a supplemental brief (Supplemental Brief). Following further argument at the March 29, 2016, Status Conference, the Presiding Judge requested that the Bureau respond point-by-point to Central Valley and Avenal's Supplemental Brief. In accordance with the Presiding Judge's request, the Bureau so responds herein.
- 2. The "Unincorporated Non-profit Association" Argument. Pursuant to Section 397(6) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (Act), and Section 73.503(a) of the Commission's rules, only a (i) public agency, (ii) nonprofit private foundation, corporation, or association; or (iii) municipality which transmits only noncommercial programs for educational purposes can qualify to own and operate NCE stations.⁶ Thus, it is axiomatic that an NCE applicant must be an established nonprofit educational organization when it files its application.⁷

¹ See Request for Permission to File Appeal (47 C.F.R. Sec. 1.301(b)), filed Jan. 14, 2016. This Request was filed by Mr. Couzens.

² See Email from Presiding Judge to the Parties, EB Docket No. 03-152, dated Feb. 19, 2016.

³ See Order, FCC 16M-12, (ALJ, rel. Mar. 23, 2016).

⁴ See Brief in Response to Order: FCC 16M-12, filed Mar. 25, 2016.

⁵ See also Order, FCC 16M-13 (ALJ, rel. Mar. 30, 2016).

⁶ See 47 U.S.C. § 397(6); see also 47 C.F.R. § 73.503(a) ("A noncommercial educational FM broadcast station will be licensed only to a nonprofit educational organization and upon showing that the station will be used for the advancement of an educational program.").

⁷ See, e.g., Hammock Environmental and Educational Community Services, 25 FCC Rcd. 12804, 12807 and n. 17 (M.B. Sept. 10, 2010)(citing FCC Form 340, Section II, Question 2, and corresponding instructions); see also

An NCE applicant cannot be just a group of individuals with no articulated educational purpose. It is clear that Central Valley and Avenal are not public agencies or municipalities. In addition, they have never suggested they were nonprofit foundations. Thus, the only issue here is whether, at the time they filed their applications for NCE stations, Central Valley and Avenal were nonprofit corporations or unincorporated nonprofit associations with an articulated educational purpose. Central Valley and Avenal did not – and cannot – establish that they were either type of entity.

- 3. In their applications for NCE stations KYAF (FM) and KAAX (FM), Central Valley and Avenal specifically represented to the Commission that, at the time of these applications, they were nonprofit corporations. They included "Inc." as part of the "Name of Applicant" and checked the "nonprofit corporation" box. However, the record plainly establishes that Central Valley and Avenal were not incorporated at the time they filed these applications. Thus, it is indisputable that neither Central Valley nor Avenal met the requirements for NCE eligibility as nonprofit educational corporations at the time they filed their respective applications.
- 4. Central Valley and Avenal now assert, for the first time, that despite checking the box for "nonprofit corporation" on their respective applications, they were actually unincorporated nonprofit associations. ¹⁰ Central Valley and Avenal appear to suggest that simply because unincorporated associations are recognized under California law as separate legal

Applications for Review of Decisions Regarding Six Applications for New Low Power FM Stations, 28 FCC Rcd. 13390, 13394 and 13396 (2013).

⁸ See, e.g., Exhibit 1, filed herewith, at FCC Form 340 pp. 1 and 2.

⁹ See Enforcement Bureau's Supplemental Motion To Add Issues With Proposed Order, filed June 18, 2015, at 4-6, ¶¶ 5-7; see also Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 16M-01 (ALJ, rel. Jan. 12, 2016), at 3-4, ¶¶ 6-7.

¹⁰ See, e.g., Supplemental Brief at 2-3.

entities, they were qualified applicants for NCE stations.¹¹ However, the Commission requires more than just an after-the-fact self-serving statement to conclude that an applicant was an unincorporated nonprofit association with an educational purpose qualified to own and operate an NCE station. In *Hammock Environmental*, for example, the Commission's Media Bureau was convinced that the NCE applicant, who claimed to be a unincorporated association, met the NCE qualification requirements only after the applicant submitted its Articles of Association & Bylaws evidencing its educational purpose and a copy of a letter to the Florida Secretary of State's Office requesting that the association be registered with the state – each of which predated the applicant's application for an NCE station.¹² Neither Central Valley nor Avenal have produced any such documentation. Thus, Central Valley and Avenal have also failed to demonstrate their NCE eligibility as unincorporated nonprofit associations with an educational purpose at the time they filed their respective applications.

5. The Non-Reserved Band Argument. Central Valley and Avenal also argue that Commission case law explicitly excuses NCE applicants who file in the non-reserved band from demonstrating their NCE eligibility at the time of filing their applications. Their only support for this assertion is a footnote which states nothing more than that low power FM (LPFM) stations must maintain NCE eligibility at all times while non-reserved band FM stations, which can change their status from noncommercial to commercial, need not. Nothing in the case Central Valley and Avenal cite specifically excludes NCE applicants in the non-reserved band from the qualification requirements of Section 397(6) of the Act or Section 73.503(a) of the

¹¹ See, e.g., id.

¹² See Hammock Environmental, 25 FCC Rcd. at 12805-07 and n. 19.

¹³ See Supplemental Brief at 3-4.

¹⁴ See id. at 4.

Commission's rules. In fact, in that very same case, the Commission actually confirms that "applicants for NCE stations ... whose eligibility is restricted by statute, must demonstrate their legal existence under pertinent state law *at the time that their applications are filed*." Thus, as the Bureau has previously argued, there is nothing in either the Commission's rules or precedent that exempts entities who apply for NCE stations in the non-reserved band from the NCE qualification requirements. ¹⁶

- 6. The LPFM Cases Argument. Despite relying on a case which primarily addresses LPFM stations, Central Valley and Avenal again challenge the Presiding Judge's application of LPFM precedent in Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 16M-01, citing alleged differences in the basic authorization policies for LPFM and non-LPFM NCE stations. However, as the Bureau noted previously, the LPFM licensing rules like the non-LPFM NCE rules similarly require that an applicant be a "nonprofit educational organization." The LPFM cases at issue offer nothing more than additional guidance on how the Commission has interpreted the "nonprofit educational organization" requirement for NCE stations such as those at issue. There can be no dispute that the Presiding Judge maintains the discretion to consider such persuasive authority in his determinative process.
- 7. The Section 1.229 Argument. Lastly, Central Valley and Avenal assert that the Bureau's request to add the NCE qualification issue was untimely. The Commission's rules allow any party to seek to modify the issues at any time when the motion "raises a question of

¹⁵ Applications for Review of Decisions Regarding Six Applications, 28 FCC Rcd. at 13394 (internally citing to Section 397(6)(A) of the Act) (emphasis added).

¹⁶ See, e.g., Enforcement Bureau's Opposition To Central Valley And Avenal's Request To Appeal Order, FCC 16M-01, filed Feb. 24, 2016, at 3-5, ¶ 3-6 (EB's Opposition).

¹⁷ See Supplemental Brief at 4-5.

¹⁸ See, e.g., EB's Opposition at 4-5, ¶ 6; compare 47 C.F.R. § 73.503(a) and 47 C.F.R. § 73.853(a)(1).

¹⁹ See Supplemental Brief at 5.

probable decisional significance and such substantial public interest importance as to warrant consideration in spite of its untimely filing"²⁰ or when other "good cause is shown for the delay in filing."²¹ The Presiding Judge has the discretion to determine when such circumstances exist.²² Moreover, Central Valley and Avenal have already recognized that the question of their qualifications to own and operate NCE stations is case-determinative.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons stated above, and for those articulated in the Bureau's February 24, 2016 Opposition, the Bureau respectfully requests that the Presiding Judge deny Central Valley and Avenal's Request to appeal *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, FCC 16M-01. Moreover, as these issues should remain in this case, and the facts are not in dispute, the permits for NCE stations KYAF (FM) and KAAX (FM), held by Central Valley and Avenal, respectively, should be vacated and the parties dismissed.

²⁰ 47 C.F.R. § 1.229(c).

²¹ 47 C.F.R. § 1.229(b)(3).

²² See, e.g., 47 C.F.R. § 1.243(k).

Respectfully submitted,

Travis LeBlanc Chief, Enforcement Bureau

Pamela S. Kane
Special Counsel
Investigations and Hearings Division
Enforcement Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW, Room 4-C330
Washington, D.C. 20554
(202) 418-1420

Michael Engel Special Counsel Market Disputes Resolution Division Enforcement Bureau Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW, Room 4-C366 Washington, D.C. 20554 (202) 418-7330

April 14, 2016

William S. Zawila

UCT 17 1 20 AM '88

DIVISION

3 IZ550 BROOKHURST STREET GARDEN GROVE, CALIFORNIA 92640 (714) 636-5040

October 13, 1988

RECEIVED BY

UUI 1 7 1988

MAIL BRANCH

Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 "M" Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Enclosed Application for a New FM Station at Firebaugh, CA

Secretary:

Enclosed for filing with the Commission is an original and two copies of an application for a new educational FM station at Firebaugh, California.

Please contact this office if you need further information in this matter.

WLZ/ff encls (3)

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM L. ZAWILA

Attorney For Central Valley Educational Services, Inc.

RECEIVED

OCT 1 7 1988

FIVI ENAIVINERS

103.1MHZ EPEC -881017MU NEW FIREBAUGH CA CENTRAL VALLEY EDUC SERVICES & I..C.

APPLICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION PERMIT FOR

For Commission Use Only File No. 27/7/7/1

NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL BROADCAST STATION
(Carefully read instructions before filling out Form—RETURN ONLY FORM TO FCC) Bad: 21

Section I ORIG	MAL Gener	al Information	-000.31 FN:10/26	
1 Name of Applicant			Street Address	
Central Valley Educat Services, Inc.	tional	112,5,5,0, Suite A	Biriojojkihjujrsiti i	S _i t _i r _i e _i e _i t _i
Garden Grove	and communications to the	State CA ne following named	ZIP Code 9 2 6 4 0	Telephone No. (Include Area Code) None.
Name			Street Address	
WILLIAM L. ZAWILA Attorney at Law		1121515101 Suite A	Biriojo iki hju iri siti i	Sitirieje iti
City [Giairidieini iGirioiviei i 2 This application is for AM	LS FM □ T	State C ₁ A V	ZIP Code [9 ₁ 2 ₁ 6 ₁ 4 ₁ 0] - [Telephone No. (Include Area Code)
(a) Channel No or Frequency: 276-A	103.1	(b) Community of	of license: City	State
		Filirieibi	amigipi i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	LL CIA
(c) Check one of the following boxes:				
☐ Major Cha ☐ Minor Cha ☐ Modificati	on for new station range in Existing station; c range in Existing station; c on of Construction Permi rant to Pending Application	all sign: t; File No. of CP:	er (ARN):	
NOTE: It is not necessary to use this form those other portions of the form			uld you do so, however, please submit	only Section I and
3 Is this application mutually exclusive	with a renewal application	17		
12 2.2.2	NO Call letters:	Community of lice	ense: City	State
l		L	<u> </u>	FCC 340 May 1985

If the answer to (a) or (b) above is Yes, attach as Exhibit No. _____, a full disclosure concerning the persons and matters involved, identifying the court or administrative body and the proceeding (by dates and file numbers), stating the facts upon which the proceeding was based or the nature of the offense committed, and disposition or current status of the matter.

(b) Is there now pending in any court or administrative body any proceeding involving any of the matters

referred to in (a)?

M NO

☐ YES

Applicants are reminded that questions 4 through 5 of this Section must be completed as to all "parties to this application" as that term is defined in the instructions to Section II of this form.

Table I Parties To Application

4 Complete Table I with respect to all parties to this application.

(Note: If the applicant considers that to furnish complete information would pose an unreasonable burden, it may request that the Commission waive the strict terms of this requirement with appropriate justification)

INSTRUCTIONS: If applicant is partnership, fill out columns (a), (b), and (d), stating as to each general or limited partner (including silent partners): (a) name and residence, (b) nature of partnership interest (i.e., general or limited), and (d) percent of ownership interest. If applicant is a corporation or an unincorporated association with 50 or fewer stockholders, stock subscribers, holders of membership certificate or other ownership interest, fill out all columns, giving the information requested as to all officers, directors and members of governing board. In addition, give the information as to all persons or entities who are the beneficial or record owners of or have the right to the capital stock, membership or ownership interests or are subscribers to such interests. If the applicant has more than 50 stockholders, stock subscribers or holders of membership certificates or other ownership interests, furnish the information as to officers, directors, members of governing board, and all persons or entities who are the beneficial or record owners of or have the right to vote 1% or more of the capital stock, membership or ownership interest. If applicant is governmental or public educational agency or institution, fill out columns (a) and (c) as to all members of the governing board and chief executive.

Name and Residence Nature of Partnership Address(es) Interest or		Director or Member of Governing Board	% of: Ownership (O) or Partnership (P) or Voting Stock (VS) or	
46	Office Held	YES NO	Membership (M)	
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	
Linda Ross 2326 Paradise Road Anaheim, CA 92806	President/Secretary	Yes	100% Ownership and Voting Stock	
	i			
	ā	1.5-		

	EWONE EMPLOYMENT OF	FUNIUMIT FROUNAM	
1. Doe	s the applicant propose to employ five or more full time employ	Yes .	X No
If Ye	s, the applicant must include an EEO program called for in the se	parate Model EEO Program (FCC 396-A).	
Section	YII CERTIFIC	ATIONS	
1. Has Rule	or will the applicant comply with the public notice requirement	of Section 73.3580 of the Commission's	No
form	the applicant reasonable assurance, in good faith, that the site on, as the location of its transmitting antenna, will be available to pose?	the applicant for the applicant's intended	No bit No.
II N	o, attach es an Exhibit, a full explanation.		
cert	resonable assurance is not based on applicant's ownership of t ifies that it has obtained such reasonable assurance by contacting the site or structure.		
,	George Sullivan Name of Person Contacted	(714) 669-1963 Telephone No. (Include area code)	
•	Person contacted: (check one box below) Owner X Owner's Agent Other (spe	ocify)	
-	anda Roos	October 14, 1988	
9	Applicant's Signature	Date	

Linda Ross, President Central Valley Educational Services, Inc.

The APPLICANT hereby waives any claim to the use of any particular frequency as against the regulatory power of the United States because of the previous use of the same, whether by license or otherwise, and requests an authorization in accordance with this application. (See Section 304 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.)

The APPLICANT acknowledges that all the statements made in this application and attached exhibits are considered material representations, and that all exhibits are a material part hereof and incorporated herein.

t .	Ones the applicant propose to employ live or more fullitime	employees?
	If the answer is Yes, the applicant must include an EEO progra	m called for in the separate 5 Point Model EEO Program [FCC Form 396 (A)].
Section	en VII . Cen	tification
	Has or will the applicant comply with the public notice requ Commission's Rules?	ulrement of Section 73.3580 of the
- BU	The second state of the second se	particular frequency as against the regulatory power of the United States nerwise, and requests an authorization in accordance with this application.
	The APPLICANT acknowledges that all the statements made and that all exhibits are a material part hereof and are inco	in this application and attached exhibits are considered material representa- rporated herein.
	The APPLICANT represents that this application is not filed application with which it may be in conflict.	for the purpose of impeding, obstructing, or delaying determination on any
throug	In accordance with Section 1.65 of the Commission's Rules of amendments, of any substantial and significant changes	s, the APPLICANT has a continuing obligation to advise the Commission, in information furnished.
٠		FORM ARE PUNISHABLE BY FINE AND IMPRISONMENT.
d	I certify that the statements in this application are true, comfaith	plete, and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, and are made in
	d and dated this <u>14th</u> day of <u>Octoo</u> Central Valley Educational Services, Inc.	19 88 . Cool
	Name of Applicant	Linda Ross President/Secretary
		Title
	FOR MOTION TO INDIVIDUA	I & DECLUDED BY THE DRIVACY ACT

FCC NOTICE TO INDIVIDUALS REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT AND THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT

The solicitation of personal information requested in this application is authorized by the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. The principal purpose for which the information will be used is to determine if the benefit requested is consistent with the public interest. The staff, consisting variously of attorneys, accountants, engineers, and application examiners, will use the information to determine whether the application should be granted, denied, dismissed, or designated for hearing. If all the information requested is not provided, the application may be returned without action having been taken upon it or its processing may be delayed while a request is made to provide the missing information. Accordingly, every effort should be made to provide all necessary information. Your response is required to obtain the requested Permit.

THE FOREGOING NOTICE IS REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974, P.L. 93-579, DECEMBER 31, 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(3), AND THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT OF 1980, P.L. 96-511, DECEMBER 11, 1980, 44 U.S.C. 3507.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Alicia McCannon, an Enforcement Analyst in the Enforcement Bureau's Investigations and Hearings Division, certifies that she has on this 14th day of April, 2016, sent copies of the foregoing "ENFORCEMENT BUREAU'S OPPOSITION TO CENTRAL VALLEY AND AVENAL'S BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO *ORDER*, FCC 16M-12" to:

The Honorable Richard L. Sippel
Chief Administrative Law Judge
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554 (by hand, courtesy copy)

Rachel Funk
Office of the Chief Adminstrative Law Judge
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554 (by hand, courtesy copy)

William Zawila, Esq.
12600 Brookhurst Street, Suite105
Garden Grove, CA 92804-4833
(714) 636-5040 (telephone)
(by first-class mail and email to william.zawila@yahoo.com)

Michael Couzens
Michael Couzens Law Office
6536 Telegraph Avenue
Suite B201
Oakland, CA 94609
(by first-class mail and email to cuz@well.com)

Alicia McCannon